

Survey Date: 11/10/04			Tree	Number: 81
GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifolia X	Q. lobataOther	Health Rating¹: □A □	B ⊠C □D □ F
			Form: ☐ symmetric ☐ minor asymmetry	
Trunk Count: 1 Height: 20'			☐ major asymm	netry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 8.5"		☐ stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 30		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decur	rent
Existing T	errain: 🔲 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature	⊠ semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square E	B ⊠C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐o	ver-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	S ⊠C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	_	xcellent
N	8	3	Foliage Density	Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
E	7	8	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes
S	7	6	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	9	6	Shading Out	☐ No Yes
NW			Cavities: None	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY S	SPREAD (FEET):	16	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		xcellent
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	⊠ F	air 🔲 Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			one	
In Impacted Area:		Leaf Size		
Proposed L	and Use: Grading		Heart Rot	⊠ No □ Yes
Impacts: R	Removal			Minor Moderate ktensive
Mitigations	: See Oak Tree Repor	t	Exudations:	No □ Yes

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #110 & #50. Interior deadwood, dead twigs, and lots of epicormic growth. Protective fencing present on 11-21-06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date: 11/10/04 Tree Number: 82			Number: 82	
GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifolia _X_	Q. lobataOther	Health Rating¹: □A ⊠	B C D F
		Form: symmetric	minor asymmetry	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 2 Heigh	t: 35'	☐ major asymm	netry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 18", 11.5"		☐ stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 65		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decur	rent
Existing T	errain: 🗌 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating 3 : \square A \boxtimes E	B □C □D □ F	⊠ mature □c	over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: □A ⊠B	C D F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		xcellent
N	21	7	Foliage Density	Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Е	19	20	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
S	18	13	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	23	6	Shading Out	⊠ No ☐ Yes
NW			Cavities: None	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	41	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		xcellent Average
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	□ F	air Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS		· · · · · · · - · · · · · · · · · ·	lone	
In Impacted Area: ☐ Yes ☐ No		Leaf Size		
Proposed I	and Use: Grading		Heart Rot	⊠ No □ Yes
Impacts: F	Removal			Minor
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report		Exudations:	⊠ No □ Yes	

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #112 & #36. Interior deadwood & many galls. Protective fencing present on 11-21-06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species): A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	Survey Date: 11/10/04 Tree Number: 83			e Number: 83
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Species:Q. agrifolia _X _Q. lobataOther		Health Rating¹: □A □B ⊠C- □D □ F	
			Form: Symmetric	minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 1 Heigh	t: 35'	☐ major asymr	netry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 23.5"		☐ stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 75		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decu	rrent
Existing T	errain: 🔲 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A ⊠E	B C D F		over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	S ⊠C- □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		Excellent
N	19	20	Foliage Density	☐ Normal ⊠ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes
Е	30	1	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes
S	28	5	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	25.5	5	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes
NW			Cavities: None	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	55.5	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	· • =	Excellent Average
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	□ [Fair Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None ☐ Minor Moderate ☑Extensive	
In Impacted Area: Yes No		Leaf Size		
Proposed I	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	⊠ No □ Yes
Impacts: R	Removal			Minor
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report		Exudations:	No □ Yes	

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #32 and #113. Lots of deadwood and branch dieback, especially on branches that run along the ground. Protective fencing present on 11-21-06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	urvey Date: 11/1/04 Tree Number: 84			e Number: 84
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:Q. agrifolia _XQ. lobataOther		Health Rating¹: ☐A ☑B- ☐C ☐D ☐ F		
			Form: Symmetric	minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 1 Heigh	t: 35'	major asym	metry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 42"		stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 85		Crown Class²: ⊠ Decu	irrent
Existing T	errain: 🔲 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature	e 🗌 semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : □A ⊠E	3+		over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: □A ⊠B	B C D F	Heritage Tree:	
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		Excellent
N	38	30	Foliage Density	⊠ Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes
Е	32	24	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
S	39	6	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No ⊠ Yes
W	33	1	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes
NW			Cavities:	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	77	Water Pocket(s):	☐ No Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	 	Excellent Average
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Fair ∐ Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None ⊠ Minor Moderate □Extensive	
In Impacted	d Area: 🛛 Yes	☐ No	Leaf Size	
Proposed L	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Impacts: F	Removal			Minor
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report		Exudations:	☐ No ☐ Yes	

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #114. Poison oak on north side around trunk. Cavity in trunk base with heart rot and beetle holes; some dead branches split in one trunk with heart rot. Protective fencing around #84-86 present on 11-21-06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 11/1/04		Tree Number: 85		
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3			
Species:	Q. agrifolia	Q. lobata X_Other	Health Rating¹: □A ☑B- □C □D □ F		
Q. lobata-	<i>berberidifolia</i> hybrid		Form: Symmetric	minor asymmetry	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 5 Heigh	t: 15'	☐ major asyn	nmetry stump sprout	
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 8.5", 3.5", 2",	4", 3"	☐ stag-head		
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 80		Crown Class ² : Dec	urrent 🛛 Excurrent	
Existing T	errain: 🗌 FI	at 🛚 Slope	Age Class: immatur	e 🗌 semi-mature	
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square B	B ⊠C □D □ F		over-mature/senescent	
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	B ⊠C- □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes	
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH		
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood Development:	Excellent	
N	17	0	Foliage Density	⊠ Normal ☐ Sparse	
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes	
Е	9	6	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes	
SE			Mainstem dieback:	⊠ No □ Yes	
S	9	1	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
W	19	0	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes	
NW			Cavities: None	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	61	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Vigor:	Excellent ⊠Average Fair □ Poor	
Support Structure:		Twig/ Branch Dieback:	None ⊠ Minor Moderate □Extensive		
In Impacted	d Area: 🛛 Yes	□ No	Leaf Size	Normal □ Small	
Proposed L	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
Impacts: Removal			Minor		

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #115 & #51. Extensive beetle holes and woodpecker holes; split in trunk with heart rot. Protective fencing around #84-86 present on 11-21-06.

Exudations:

No
 □ Yes

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	Survey Date: 11/10/04 Tree Number: 86			Number: 86
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifolia	_Q. lobata <u>X</u> _ Other	Health Rating¹: ☐A ☐B ☐C ☐D ☐ F	
Q. lobata-	<i>berberidifolia</i> hybrid		Form: symmetric	minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 2 Heigh	t: 25'	☐ major asymn	netry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 12", 7"		☐ stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 75		Crown Class²: ⊠ Decu	rrent
Existing T	errain: 🗌 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature	
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square E	3 ⊠C+ □D □ F	☐ mature ☐	over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: □A ⊠B	B □C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		Excellent
N	12	15	Foliage Density	⊠ Normal ☐ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Е	12	7	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
S	15	7	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	17	10	Shading Out	⊠ No ☐ Yes
NW			Cavities: None	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	66	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	9	Excellent Average
Support Structure:			Fair ∐ Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None ⊠ Minor Moderate □Extensive	
In Impacted Area: ⊠ Yes □ No		Leaf Size	Normal □ Small	
Proposed L	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	⊠ No □ Yes
Impacts: R	Removal			Minor
Mitigations	· See Oak Tree Renor	+	Fyudations:	⊠ No □ Yes

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #116 & #34. Scrub oak to south; some interior dieback; and yellow spots on some leaves (possible chlorosis). Protective fencing around #84-86 present on 11-21-06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 11/10/04		Tree Number: 87		
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3			
Species:	Species:Q. agrifolia _X _Q. lobataOther		Health Rating¹: □A □]B ⊠C- □D □ F	
			Form: Symmetric	minor asymmetry	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 1 Heigh	t: 35'	☐ major asymr	netry stump sprout	
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 34"		☐ stag-head		
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 75		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decu	rrent	
Existing T	errain: 🛛 F	at Slope	Age Class: immature	semi-mature	
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : □A ⊠E	3+		over-mature/senescent	
Overall Gr	ade: □A □B	B ⊠C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	Yes	
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH		
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		Excellent	
N	26	4	Foliage Density	⊠ Normal □ Sparse	
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes	
Е	29	10	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes	
SE			Mainstem dieback:	⊠ No □ Yes	
S	24	8	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes	
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes	
W	19	5	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes	
NW			Cavities:		
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No □ Yes	
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	50	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No □ Yes	
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	No □ Yes	
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Excellent Average	
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Fair ∐ Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None		
In Impacted	d Area: 🛛 Yes	☐ No	Leaf Size		
Proposed L	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
Impacts: E	Encroachment			Minor Moderate extensive	
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report		Exudations:	No □ Yes □ ■ Yes □ ■ Yes □ □ □		

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #35 and #117. Large conk on south side of trunk, cavity below conk (hollow inside), and large dead branch to east side of trunk. Several broken scaffold branches. Bees in hollow broken branch on S. side. Protective fencing present on 11-21-06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	Survey Date: 11/10/04 Tree Number: 88			Number: 88
GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS	 S		
Species:	Species:Q. agrifoliaQ. lobata _X _Other		Health Rating¹: □A □]B ⊠C+ □D □ F
Q. berberio	Q. berberidifolia		Form: Symmetric minor asymmetry	
Trunk Cou	unt: 2 Heigh	t: 10'	☐ major asymr	metry 🗌 stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 6", 6"		☐ stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 85		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decu	rrent
Existing T	errain: 🔲 F	lat 🛛 Slope	Age Class: 🛛 immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square E	B ⊠C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐	over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	rade: 🔲 A 🔲 I	B ⊠C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	Yes
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		Excellent
N	11	7	Foliage Density	Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Е	8	7	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
S	9	3	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	12	3	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No □ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	20	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	Deadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	」 ⋯3⋯	Excellent Average
Support Structure:			Fair ∐ Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None ⊠ Minor Moderate □Extensive	
In Impacte	d Area: 🛛 Yes	□ No	Leaf Size	
Proposed I	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Impacts: F	Removal			Minor
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report		Exudations:	⊠ No □ Yes	

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #106. One dead trunk (3" dbh) and broken branches with heart rot. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 11/1/04		Tree Number: 89		
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3			
Species:	Species:Q. agrifoliaQ. lobataX Other		Health Rating¹: ☐A ☐B ☐C ☐D ☐ F		
Q. berberio	Q. berberidifolia		Form: Symmetric	minor asymmetry	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 2 Heigh	t: 12'	☐ major asymr	metry stump sprout	
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 6", 6"		☐ stag-head		
Percent C	anopy Cover: 90		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decu	rrent	
Existing T	errain: 🗌 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: 🛛 immature	semi-mature	
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square E	B ⊠C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐	over-mature/senescent	
Overall Gr	ade: □A ⊠I	3-	Heritage Tree: No	Yes	
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH		
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	I ==	Excellent	
N	15	10	Foliage Density	⊠ Normal ☐ Sparse	
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Е	15	5	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SE			Mainstem dieback:	⊠ No □ Yes	
S	13	0	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes	
W	0	0	Shading Out	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
NW			Cavities: None	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No □ Yes	
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	28	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No □ Yes	
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Excellent Average	
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	L'	Fair ☐ Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None		
In Impacte	d Area: 🛛 Yes	☐ No	Leaf Size		
Proposed I	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	⊠ No □ Yes	
Impacts: F	Removal			Minor	
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report		Exudations:	No □ Yes		

Comments & Notes: Old #107. Animal burrow at trunk base and some small sucker growths from base. It is adjacent to #90. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	vey Date: 11/10/04 Tree Number: 90			Number: 90
GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS			
Species:	Q. agrifolia	Q. lobata X Other	Health Rating¹: □A ⊠	B □C □D □ F
Q. berberio	difolia		Form: Symmetric [minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 3 Heigh	t: 15'	☐ major asymm	netry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 6", 4", 8.5"		☐ stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 85		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decur	rent
Existing T	errain: 🔲 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature	
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square E	B ⊠C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐o	ver-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: □A ⊠I	3-	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		xcellent
N	12	4	Foliage Density	
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes
E	13	2	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	⊠ No □ Yes
S	11	2	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	11	8	Shading Out	☐ No Yes
NW			Cavities: None	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No □ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	24	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	9	xcellent Average
Support Structure:		LJ F	air 🔲 Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			one ⊠ Minor loderate □Extensive	
In Impacted Area: 🛛 Yes 🗌 No		Leaf Size		
Proposed L	_and Use: Grading		Heart Rot	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Impacts: Removal			Minor Moderate Moderate	

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #108. Animal burrow at trunk base, sprouts from ground adjacent to trunk. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

Exudations:

No
 □ Yes

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 11/10/04		Tree Number: 97		
GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS	3			
Species:	Species:Q. agrifoliaQ. lobata _X_Other		Health Rating¹: □A □B ⊠C+ □D □ F		
Q. berberio	Q. berberidifolia		Form: symmetric minor asymmetry		
Trunk Cou	unt: 3 Height	t: 12'	⊠ major asymr	metry stump sprout	
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 7.5", 2.5", 4.5	"	☐ stag-head		
Percent C	anopy Cover: 60		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decu	rrent	
Existing T	errain: 🔲 F	lat 🛛 Slope	Age Class: 🛛 immature	semi-mature	
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square E	B ⊠C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐	over-mature/senescent	
Overall Gr	rade: □A □I	B ⊠C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	Yes	
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH		
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		Excellent	
N	8	6	Foliage Density	⊠ Normal ☐ Sparse	
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Е	6	6	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes	
SE			Mainstem dieback:	⊠ No □ Yes	
S	7	1	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
W	10	3	Shading Out	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
NW			Cavities: None	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No □ Yes	
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	16	Water Pocket(s):	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	」•	Excellent Average	
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Fair ∐ Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS		_	None ⊠ Minor Moderate □Extensive		
In Impacte	d Area: 🛛 Yes	☐ No	Leaf Size		
Proposed I	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Impacts: F	Removal			Minor	
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report		Exudations:	No □ Yes □ ■ Yes □		

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #120. Small scrub oaks growing to the south. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 11/10/04		Tree Number: 100		
GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS	3			
Species:	Q. agrifolia	Q. lobata X Other	Health Rating¹: □A ☑B- □C □D □ F		
Q. berberio	difolia		Form: Symmetric [minor asymmetry	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 2 Heigh	t: 12'	☐ major asymm	netry stump sprout	
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 6", 6"		stag-head		
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 60		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decur	rent	
Existing T	errain: 🗌 FI	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature		
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A □B	B ⊠C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐c	over-mature/senescent	
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	S ⊠C+ □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes	
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH		
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		xcellent	
N	8	7	Foliage Density	⊠ Normal ☐ Sparse	
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
E	7	5	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SE			Mainstem dieback:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
S	9	2	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes	
W	14	4	Shading Out	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
NW			Cavities: None	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	21	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		xcellent Average	
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No		air	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			lone ⊠ Minor loderate □Extensive		
In Impacted	d Area: Xes	□ No	Leaf Size		
Proposed L	and Use: Grading		Heart Rot	⊠ No □ Yes	
Impacts: R	Removal			Minor	
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report		Exudations:	No ☐ Yes		

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #125. Base (collar) of trunk buried by eroded soil. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	Survey Date: 11/10/04 Tree Number: 101			Number: 101
GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS	 S		
Species:	Q. agrifolia	_Q. lobata _X Other	Health Rating¹: ☐A ☐	B- □C □D ☑ F
Q. berberio	difolia		Form: symmetric	minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 3 Heigh	t: 12'	☐ major asymm	etry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 4.5", 6.5", 5.5	,,	☐ stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 0		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decuri	rent
Existing To	errain:	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: ⊠ immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A □E	B □C+ □D 図 F	☐ mature ☐o	ver-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: □A □B	B □C+ □D ☑ F	Heritage Tree: No [Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		xcellent
N	0	0	Foliage Density	☐ Normal ⊠ Sparse
NE	-	-	Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
E	0	0	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes
S	0	0	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	0	0	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes
NW			Cavities: None	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No □ Yes
CANOPY S	SPREAD (FEET):	0	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No □ Yes
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		xcellent Average
Support Structure:		L F	air 🛚 🖾 Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			one ☐ Minor oderate ⊠Extensive	
In Impacted	d Area: 🛛 Yes	☐ No	Leaf Size	Normal □ Small
Proposed L	and Use: Grading		Heart Rot	⊠ No □ Yes
Impacts: Removal			Borers/ Ants	Minor

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #127. Resurveyed on 11-21-06: TREE IS DEAD – PREVIOUSLY RECEIVED AN OVERALL GRADE OF C+. Extensive grading activity surrounds the tree and occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

Exudations:

No
 □ Yes

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date: 11/10/04 Tree Num			Number: 102	
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Species:Q. agrifoliaX_Q. lobataOther		Health Rating¹: □A ⊠	B □C □D □ F
			Form: symmetric	minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 1 Heigh	t: 45'	☐ major asymm	netry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 26"		☐ stag-head	
Percent C	anopy Cover: 75		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decur	rent
Existing T	errain: 🗌 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : 🖂A 🔲 🛭	B □C □D □ F	⊠ mature □c	over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: □A ⊠B	3+	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		xcellent Average Oor None
N	22	20	Foliage Density	Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	☐ No Yes
Е	22	10	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	⊠ No □ Yes
S	23	15	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	28	17	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes
NW			Cavities: None	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	50	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	···3··· -	xcellent Average
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	□F	air
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS		_	lone ⊠ Minor loderate □Extensive	
In Impacte	d Area: 🛛 Yes	☐ No	Leaf Size	
Proposed I	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	⊠ No □ Yes
Impacts: F	Removal			Minor
Mitigations	See Oak Tree Renor	+	Fyudations:	M No □ Yes

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #129. Soil is higher on west side of the tree. Extensive grading activity surrounds the tree and occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	urvey Date: 11/11/04 Tree Number: 103			e Number: 103
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifolia	Q. lobata X Other	Health Rating¹: □A □B ⊠C □D □ F	
Q. berberio	Q. berberidifolia		Form: Symmetric	minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 4 Heigh	t: 20'	☐ major asym	metry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 6", 6.5", 9", 4	,,	stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 100		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decu	urrent
Existing T	errain: 🔲 Fl	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: 🛛 immature	e 🗌 semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square B	B ⊠C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐	over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	B ⊠C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		Excellent
N	15	10	Foliage Density	⊠ Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Е	15	10	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes
S	10	8	Exposed Roots:	☐ No Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	12	10	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ⊠ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	27	Water Pocket(s):	☐ No Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Excellent Average
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Fair Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None	
In Impacte	d Area: 🛛 Yes	☐ No	Leaf Size	
Proposed I	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Impacts: F	Removal			Minor
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report		Exudations:	No Yes	

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #145. Woodrat's nest, broken branches, beetle holes, and trunk collar is exposed due to erosion on north side. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	Survey Date: 11/11/04 Tree Number: 106			
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifolia	Q. lobata X Other	Health Rating¹: □A □]B ⊠C- □D □ F
Q. berberio	Q. berberidifolia		Form: ⊠ symmetric ☐ minor asymmetry	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 6 Heigh	t: 60'	☐ major asymr	metry 🗌 stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 6", 2", 1", 6",	3", 3"- at 2'	☐ stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 95		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decu	rrent
Existing T	errain:	lat 🛛 Slope	Age Class: 🛛 immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square E	B ⊠C- □D □ F	☐ mature ☐	over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: 🗆 🗆 A	B ⊠C- □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		Excellent
N	12	6	Foliage Density	⊠ Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes
Е	12	2	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes
S	14	4	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	7	6	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No □ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	26	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	· • =	Excellent Average
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	□ F	Fair Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None ☐ Minor Moderate ☑Extensive	
In Impacted	d Area: 🛛 Yes	☐ No	Leaf Size	
Proposed L	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Impacts: F	Removal		· —	Minor
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report		Exudations:	No	

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #142. Woodrat's nest. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species): A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date: 11/2/04

LDC Project No: <u>97001-011</u>

Troe Number: 109

Survey Date	E. 11/3/04		116	e Number. 100
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifolia	_Q. lobataX Other	Health Rating¹: □A □]B □C ☑D □ F
Q. berberio	difolia		Form: symmetric minor asymmetry	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 3 Heigh	t: 12'		metry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 6", 6.5", one	dead trunk	☐ stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 90		Crown Class ² : Decu	rrent
Existing T	errain: 🔲 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: 🛛 immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A □E	B □C 図D □ F	☐ mature ☐	over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	B □C 図D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		Excellent
N	13	9	Foliage Density	⊠ Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes
Е	13	7	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes
S	10	10	Exposed Roots:	☐ No Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	13	10	Shading Out	☐ No Yes
NW			Cavities:	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY S	SPREAD (FEET):	26	Water Pocket(s):	☐ No Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No □ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Excellent Average
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Fair Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None ☐ Minor Moderate ☑Extensive	
In Impacted	d Area: 🛛 Yes	□ No	Leaf Size	
Proposed L	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Impacts: R	Removal			Minor
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report		Exudations:	No □ Yes	

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #137. Fire damage and one dead trunk. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Da	te: 11/11/04		Tree Number: 109		
GENERA	L CHARACTERISTICS	3			
Species:	Q. agrifolia	_Q. lobataX Other	Health Rating¹: □A ⊠	B- □C □D □ F	
Q. berbei	ridifolia		Form: symmetric	minor asymmetry	
Trunk Co	ount: 3 Heigh	t: 18'	☐ major asymm	netry stump sprout	
Trunk DE	3H (in.): 6", 6.5", 1"		☐ stag-head		
Percent (Canopy Cover: 85		Crown Class ² : ☐ Decur	rent 🛛 Excurrent	
Existing	Terrain:	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: 🛛 immature	semi-mature	
Aesthetic	c Rating³: □A ⊠E	B C D F	☐ mature ☐ c	ver-mature/senescent	
Overall G	Grade: \square A \boxtimes E	3- □C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes	
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH		
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood Development: □ E	xcellent	
N	13	10	Foliage Density		
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Е	11	8	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes	
S	7	10	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes	
W	14	15	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes	
NW			Cavities: None	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	25	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
PROPOS	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
Monitor 1	for Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Treat Infe	estations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus: ⊠ No ☐ Yes		

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #134. Fire damage.

Remove Deadwood:

Support Structure:

In Impacted Area:

Impacts: Removal

IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS

Proposed Land Use: Grading

Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report

☐ Yes

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ No

□ No

Vigor:

Twig/ Branch

Dieback:

Leaf Size

Heart Rot

/Termites

Borers/ Ants

Exudations:

☐ Excellent

☐ None ☐ Minor ☐ Moderate ☐ Extensive

No ☐ Yes

⊠ No

Normal
 □ Small

Yes

☐ Moderate

☐ Fair

☐ Extensive

⊠Average

☐ Poor

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 11/11/04		Tree Number: 111		
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	S			
Species:	Q. agrifolia	_Q. lobataX_ Other	Health Rating¹: □A □B ⊠C □D □ F		
Q. berberio	difolia		Form: symmetric		
Trunk Cou	ınt: 2 Heigh	t: 13'	☐ major asymr	netry stump sprout	
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 6", 6"		☐ stag-head		
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 70		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decu	rrent	
Existing T	errain: 🔲 F	at 🛚 Slope	Age Class: 🛛 immature	semi-mature	
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square E	B ⊠C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐	over-mature/senescent	
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	B ⊠C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	Yes	
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH		
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	I ==	Excellent Average	
N	11	15	Foliage Density		
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes	
Е	7	10	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes	
S	10	8	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SW			Epicormic ⁴ growth	☐ No Yes	
W	9	7	Shading Out	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No □ Yes	
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	21	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No □ Yes	
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Excellent Average	
Support S	Support Structure:		Fair ☐ Poor		
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None ☐ Minor Moderate ☐Extensive		
In Impacted Area: ⊠ Yes □ No		Leaf Size			
Proposed I	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
Impacts: F	Removal		I =	Minor Moderate xtensive	
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report		Exudations:	No □ Yes □ ■ Yes □		

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #136. Fire damage. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 11/11/04		Tree	Number: 113
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifolia	_Q. lobataX Other	Health Rating¹: □A □	B ⊠C □D □ F
Q. berberio	Q. berberidifolia		Form: symmetric	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 2 Heigh	t : 15'	☐ major asymn	netry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 7.5", 4.5"		☐ stag-head	
Percent C	anopy Cover: 100		Crown Class ² : Decui	rrent 🛛 Excurrent
Existing T	errain: 🗌 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: 🛛 immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : □A ⊠E	B □C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐	over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: □A □B	B ⊠C- □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		Excellent
N	15	4	Foliage Density	⊠ Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes
Е	17	4	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes
S	10	12	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	15	4	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ☒ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	☐ No Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	32	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		xcellent Average
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Fair ☐ Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS		· · · · · · · · ·	None ☐ Minor Moderate ⊠Extensive	
In Impacte	d Area: 🛛 Yes	□ No	Leaf Size	Normal □ Small
Proposed I	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Impacts: F	Removal			Minor
Mitigations	· See Oak Tree Reno	rt	Fyudations:	□ No ⊠ Yes

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #131. Fire damage. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	Survey Date: 11/11/04 Tree Number: 115			Number: 115
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	S		
Species:	Q. agrifolia	_Q. lobataX_ Other	Health Rating¹: □A □B ⊠C+ □D □ F	
Q. berberidifolia			Form: Symmetric	minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 2 Heigh	t: 15'	☐ major asymm	etry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 6", 8"		☐ stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 100		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decurr	ent
Existing T	errain:	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: 🛛 immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A ⊠E	B □C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐o	ver-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: □A ⊠E	B- □C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No [Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		xcellent
N	11	1	Foliage Density	Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
E	12	1	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	⊠ No □ Yes
S	10	5	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	13	1	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No □ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	25	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No □ Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	☐ No Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		xcellent Average
Support Structure:		☐ F8	air 🗌 Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS		, <u> </u>	one ☐ Minor oderate ⊠Extensive	
In Impacted	d Area: 🛛 Yes	☐ No	Leaf Size	Normal □ Small
Proposed L	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	⊠ No □ Yes
Impacts: Removal			Borers/ Ants	Minor Moderate ttensive

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #149. Brown leaves and sprouting from base. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

Exudations:

□ No ⊠ Yes

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date: 11/11/04			Tree	Number: 116
GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS)		
Species:	Q. agrifolia	Q. lobata X Other	Health Rating¹: □A □E	B □C ☑D □ F
Q. berberidifolia			Form: symmetric	minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 5 Heigh	t : 15'		etry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 10", 4", 2", 2"	', 1.5"	☐ stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 90		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decurre	ent
Existing T	errain:	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: 🛛 immature [semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square B	C ⊠D □ F	☐ mature ☐ov	ver-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	□C ☑D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood Development: □ Ex	ccellent
N	15	12	Foliage Density	⊠ Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes
E	15	6	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	□ No ⊠ Yes
S	12	3	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	□ No Yes
W	18	1	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes
NW			Cavities:	☑ Trunk ☑ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No □ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	33	Water Pocket(s):	□ No Yes
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No □ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No □ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	_	cellent Average
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	⊠ Fa	iir
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS		_ · · · · 3 · _ · · · ·	one	
In Impacted Area: ⊠ Yes □ No		Leaf Size	⊠ Normal □ Small	
Proposed I	and Use: Grading		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Impacts: Removal			Borers/ Ants	inor

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #148. Broken branches, fire damage, hollow trunk, lots of sprouting in trunks and one broken trunk. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

Exudations:

No □ Yes

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	Survey Date: 11/11/04 Tree Number: 117			Number: 117
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	;		
Species:	Q. agrifolia	Q. lobata X Other	Health Rating¹: □A □B	B ⊠C □D □ F
Q. berberidifolia			Form: Symmetric	minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 5 Heigh	t: 25'	☐ major asymme	etry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 3.5", 6.5", 9.5	", 10", 2"	☐ stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 100		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decurre	ent
Existing T	errain: 🔲 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature [semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A ⊠E	B □C □D □ F	⊠ mature □ov	ver-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	rade: □A □B	S ⊠C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood Ex Development: Po	ccellent
N	14	5	Foliage Density	⊠ Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes
E	16	6	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	□ No Yes
S	17	4	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	□ No Yes
W	18	6	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ⊠ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No □ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	34	Water Pocket(s):	□ No ⊠ Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No □ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No □ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	J 3' = _	ccellent Average
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	∐ Fa	iir ∐ Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			one	
In Impacted Area: ☐ Yes ☐ No		Leaf Size	Normal □ Small	
Proposed I	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	□ No ⊠ Yes
Impacts: Removal			Borers/ Ants	inor

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #150. Fire damage and beetle holes. Couple of dead trunks. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

Exudations:

No ☐ Yes

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date: 11/11/04 Tree Number: 118			Number: 118	
GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifolia _X	Q. lobataOther	Health Rating¹: □A ⊠	B □C □D □ F
			Form: ⊠ symmetric ☐ minor asymmetry	
Trunk Cou	unt: 1 Heigh	it : 50'	☐ major asymm	etry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 27.5"		stag-head	
Percent C	anopy Cover: 90		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decuri	rent
Existing T	errain:	lat 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating 3 : $\square A \boxtimes E$	B □C □D □ F	⊠ mature □o	ver-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	rade: □A ⊠E	B □C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No [Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	_	xcellent Average Oor None
N	25	4	Foliage Density	⊠ Normal ☐ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
E	24	5	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
S	31	5	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	26	9	Shading Out	⊠ No ☐ Yes
NW			Cavities: None	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	56	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	Deadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		xcellent Average
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Fa	air 🔲 Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			one ⊠ Minor loderate □Extensive	
In Impacte	d Area: 🛛 Yes	☐ No	Leaf Size	
Proposed I	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	⊠ No □ Yes
Impacts: Removal		Borers/ Ants	Minor	

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #157. Fire damage and next to fence. Extensive grading activity surrounds the tree and occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

Exudations:

No ☐ Yes

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date: 11/11/04 Tree Number: 120				
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifolia	_Q. lobataX_ Other	Health Rating¹: ☐A ☐B ☐C ☐D ☐ F	=
Q. berberio	difolia		Form: ☐ symmetric ☐ minor asymmetry	,
Trunk Cou	ınt: 3 Heigh	t: 20'	☐ major asymmetry ☐ stump spro	ut
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 6.5", 4", 7"		stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 100		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decurrent ☐ Excurrent	t
Existing T	errain:	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: ⊠ immature ☐ semi-mature	
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A ⊠E	B □C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐over-mature/senesce	ent
Overall Gr	ade: □A ⊠E	B □C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: ⊠ No □ Yes	
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood Development: ☐ Excellent ☐ Avera ☐ Poor ☐ None	
N	7	10	Foliage Density ⊠ Normal ☐ Spar	rse
NE			Weak crotches: ⊠ No ☐ Yes	;
E	7	1	Oak Pit Scale: No Yes	;
SE			Mainstem dieback: ⊠ No ☐ Yes	;
S	10	10	Exposed Roots:	;
SW			Epicormic growth	;
W	12	9	Shading Out	;
NW			Cavities: Trunk Bran	ich
			Exfoliating Bark:	;
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	19	Water Pocket(s): ⊠ No ⊠ Yes	;
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage: ☐ Trunk ☐ Bran	ich
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls: ⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus: No Yes	
Remove Deadwood:		☐ Yes ☐ No	Vigor: ☐ Excellent ☐ Avera	-
Support Structure:		☐ Yes ☐ No	⊠ Fair ☐ Poo	r
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			Twig/ Branch ☐ None ☐ Minor ☐ Moderate ☐ Extension	ve
In Impacted Area: ☐ Yes ☐ No		□ No	Leaf Size ⊠ Normal ☐ Sm	nall
Proposed L	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot ⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Impacts: Removal			Borers/ Ants	rate

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #52. Lots of sprouts and fallen dead trunk. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

Exudations:

No □ Yes

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	Survey Date: 11/11/04 Tree Number: 122			er: 122
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifolia	_Q. lobataX Other	Health Rating¹: □A □B □C ☑D □ F	
Q. berberio	difolia		Form: symmetric mind	or asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 2 Heigh	t: 15'		stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 3", 7", 7"		☐ stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 90		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decurrent	☐ Excurrent
Existing T	errain: 🗌 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: ⊠ immature □ ser	mi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square E	B □C ☑D □ F	☐ mature ☐over-ma	ature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	B □C 図D □ F	Heritage Tree: No Yes	s
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood ☐ Exceller ☐ Poor	at Average None
N	7	12	Foliage Density	ormal Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	o 🗌 Yes
Е	11	10	Oak Pit Scale:	o 🗌 Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	o 🛚 Yes
S	12	5	Exposed Roots:	o 🗌 Yes
SW			Epicormic growth N	o 🛚 Yes
W	8	6	Shading Out N	o 🗌 Yes
NW				runk 🛚 Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	o 🗌 Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	19	Water Pocket(s):	o 🛛 Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage: Tri	unk 🗌 Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	lo 🗌 Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	o 🗌 Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Vigor: Exceller	
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	⊠ Fair	☐ Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS		Twig/ Branch ☐ None ☐ Moderat	☐ Minor e ⊠Extensive	
In Impacte	d Area: 🛛 Yes	☐ No	Leaf Size 🛛 N	ormal Small
Proposed I	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	lo 🛛 Yes
Impacts: F	Removal		Borers/ Ants /Termites ☐ Minor ☐ Extensive	☐ Moderate e
Mitigations	: See Oak Tree Repo	rt	Exudations:	o 🗌 Yes

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #51. Sprouting, dead trunks, fire damage, and wood-rats nest. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 11/11/04		Tre	e Number: 124
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifolia	_Q. lobataX Other	Health Rating ¹ :	B □C ☑D □ F
Q. berberio	difolia		Form: symmetric	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 4 Heigh	t: 15'	☐ major asym	metry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 6", 6", 2", 5"		stag-head	
Percent C	anopy Cover: 100		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decu	irrent
Existing T	errain:	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: 🛛 immature	e 🗌 semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square E	B □C 図D □ F	mature	over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	B □C 図D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		Excellent Average Poor None
N	11	7	Foliage Density	⊠ Normal ☐ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Е	4	10	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes
S	7	10	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	8	5	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	18	Water Pocket(s):	☐ No Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	···3···	Excellent Average
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Fair ∐ Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None ☐ Minor Moderate ☑Extensive	
In Impacte	d Area: 🛛 Yes	☐ No	Leaf Size	
Proposed I	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Impacts: Removal			Minor	
Mitigations	: See Oak Tree Repo	rt	Exudations:	No □ Yes ■ Yes

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #50. Fire damage, lots of dead branches, sprouts, couple of dead trunks, and hollow all the way up through the trunk. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 11/11/04		Tree	Number: 125
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS)		
Species:	Q. agrifolia	Q. lobata X Other	Health Rating¹: □A ⊠	B □C □D □ F
Q. berberio	difolia		Form: Symmetric S	minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 3 Heigh	t: 25'	☐ major asymm	etry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 6", 8.5", 9.5"		☐ stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 100		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decur	rent 🛛 Excurrent
Existing T	errain: 🛛 🖂 FI	at Slope	Age Class: immature	
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \boxtimes B	B □C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐o	ver-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: □A ⊠B	C D D F	Heritage Tree: No	Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		xcellent
N	16	2	Foliage Density	Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Е	22	6	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	⊠ No □ Yes
S	17	7	Exposed Roots:	☐ No Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	21	5	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes
NW			Cavities: None	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	43	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		xcellent Average
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No		air 🔲 Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			one	
In Impacted	d Area: Xes	□ No	Leaf Size	
Proposed L	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	⊠ No □ Yes
Impacts: Removal			Minor	
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report		Exudations:	No □ Yes	

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #48. Lots of trash, minor exposed roots, and basal flair. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	urvey Date: 11/11/04 Tree Number: 126			e Number: 126
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:Q. agrifoliaQ. lobataX_ Other			Health Rating¹: □A □B ☑C □D □ F	
Q. berberio	difolia		Form: Symmetric	minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 2 Heigh	t : 15'	☐ major asymr	netry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 6", 6"		☐ stag-head	
Percent C	anopy Cover: 60		Crown Class ² : ☐ Decu	rrent 🛛 Excurrent
Existing T	errain: 🗌 FI	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: 🛛 immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square B	B ⊠C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐	over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	B ⊠C+ □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		Excellent
N	7	7	Foliage Density	⊠ Normal ☐ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes
Е	8	7	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes
S	9	8	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	8	8	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes
NW			Cavities: None	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No □ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	16	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No □ Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	···3···	Excellent Average
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	⊠ F	Fair ∐ Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None ☐ Minor Moderate ☑Extensive	
In Impacte	d Area: Xes	☐ No	Leaf Size	Normal □ Small
Proposed I	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	⊠ No □ Yes
Impacts: Removal			Minor	
Mitigations	· See Oak Tree Reno	rt	Fyudations:	⊠ No □ Yes

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #47. Fire damage and sprouts. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	urvey Date: 11/11/04 Tree Number: 128			Number: 128
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifolia	_Q. lobataX Other	Health Rating¹: □A □]B □C 図D □ F
Q. berberio	difolia		Form: symmetric	minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 4 Heigh	t: 15'	☐ major asymn	netry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 6", 6", 4", 3"		☐ stag-head	
Percent C	anopy Cover: 60		Crown Class ² : ☐ Decui	rrent 🛛 Excurrent
Existing T	errain: 🗌 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: 🛛 immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square E	B □C 図D □ F	☐ mature ☐ d	over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: □A □B	B □C 図D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood ☐ E ☐ E ☐ E ☐ F	Excellent Average Poor None
N	0	0	Foliage Density	☐ Normal ⊠ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes
Е	7	12	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes
S	10	6	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	8	12	Shading Out	⊠ No ☐ Yes
NW			Cavities:	□ Trunk □ Branch □
			Exfoliating Bark:	☐ No Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	15	Water Pocket(s):	☐ No Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		xcellent Average
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	⊠ F	fair Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS		_	None ☐ Minor Moderate ⊠Extensive	
In Impacte	In Impacted Area: ☐ Yes ☐ No		Leaf Size	Normal □ Small
Proposed I	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Impacts: Removal		_	Minor	
Mitigations	: See Oak Tree Repo	rt	Exudations:	⊠ No □ Yes

Comments & Notes: Beetle holes and hollow. 5" dead trunk. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species): A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	urvey Date: 11/11/04 Tree Number: 129			
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:Q. agrifoliaQ. lobataX_ Other			Health Rating¹: □A □	B ⊠C □D □ F
Q. berberio	difolia		Form: symmetric	minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 1 Height	:: 18'	☐ major asymm	etry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 12"		stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 90		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decuri	rent
Existing T	errain: 🔲 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature	
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square E	B ⊠C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐o	ver-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	S ⊠C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No [Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood Development: □ Ex	xcellent Average Oor None
N	7	10	Foliage Density	Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
E	9	11	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes
S	9	6	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	10	9	Shading Out	⊠ No ☐ Yes
NW			Cavities:	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	19	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove Deadwood:		☐ Yes ☐ No	J 3' = _	xcellent Average
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	∐ Fa	air ∐ Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS		,	one ☐ Minor loderate ⊠Extensive	
In Impacted Area: ☐ Yes ☐ No		Leaf Size		
Proposed Land Use: Grading			Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Impacts: Removal		Borers/ Ants	Minor	

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #41. Fire damage, hollow, and broken scaffold branches. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

Exudations:

No ☐ Yes

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	Survey Date: 11/11/04 Tree Number: 130		
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3	
Species:	Q. agrifolia	Q. lobata X Other	Health Rating¹: ☐A ☐B ☑C- ☐D ☐ F
Q. berberio	difolia		Form: ☐ symmetric ☒ minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 3 Heigh	t: 25'	☐ major asymmetry ☐ stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 14.5", 2", 5"		☐ stag-head
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 85		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decurrent ⊠ Excurrent
Existing T	errain:	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: ☐ immature ☒ semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square E	B ⊠C- □D □ F	☐ mature ☐over-mature/senescen
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 E	B ⊠C- □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood Development: □ Excellent □ Average □ Poor □ None
N	14	2	Foliage Density ⊠ Normal ☐ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches: ⊠ No ☐ Yes
E	13	8	Oak Pit Scale: No Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback: ☐ No ☐ Yes
S	13	12	Exposed Roots:
SW			Epicormic growth
W	11	4	Shading Out ⊠ No ☐ Yes
NW			Cavities: None ⊠ Trunk ⊠ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	27	Water Pocket(s): ⊠ No ☐ Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage: ☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls: ⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus: ⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Vigor: ☐ Excellent ☐ Averag
Support Structure:		☐ Yes ☐ No	⊠ Fair ☐ Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			Twig/ Branch ☐ None ☐ Minor ☐ Moderate ☐ Extensive
In Impacted Area: ⊠ Yes □ No		No	Leaf Size ⊠ Normal ☐ Smal
Proposed Land Use: Grading			Heart Rot ☐ No ☑ Yes
Impacts: Removal			Borers/ Ants

Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report No □ Yes Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #43. Fire damage. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

Exudations:

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 11/11/04		Tree Number: 131		
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	;			
Species:Q. agrifoliaQ. lobataX_ Other		Health Rating¹: □A □	B ⊠C □D □ F		
Q. berberio	difolia		Form: symmetric	minor asymmetry	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 4 Heigh	t : 20'	☐ major asymn	netry stump sprout	
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 7", 5.5", 7.5",	7.5"	☐ stag-head		
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 90		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decur	rent 🛛 Excurrent	
Existing T	errain: 🗌 FI	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: 🛛 immature	semi-mature	
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : □A □B	B ⊠C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐ c	over-mature/senescent	
Overall Gr	rade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	S ⊠C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes	
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH		
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood Development: □ E	excellent Average	
N	13	5	Foliage Density	Normal □ Sparse	
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
E	20	8	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes	
S	14	7	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes	
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes	
W	12	10	Shading Out	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
			Exfoliating Bark:	☐ No Yes	
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	32	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	=	excellent Average	
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No		air	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS		, <u> </u>	lone ☐ Minor Moderate ⊠Extensive		
In Impacted	d Area: Xes	□ No	Leaf Size	Normal □ Small	
Proposed L	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
Impacts: F	Removal			Minor	
Mitigations	· See Oak Tree Reno	rt	Fyudations:	⊠ No □ Yes	

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #42. Fire damage and hollow. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	Survey Date: 11/11/04 Tree Number: 132			
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifoliaX	Q. lobata Other	Health Rating¹: ⊠A □B □C □D □ F	
			Form: ☐ symmetric ☐ minor asymmetry	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 2 Heigh	t: 30'	☐ major asymmetry ☐ stump sprout	
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 15.5", 16.5"		stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 85		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decurrent ☐ Excurrent	
Existing T	errain: 🛛 🗀 F	at Slope	Age Class: ☐ immature ☐ semi-mature	
Aesthetic	Rating³: ⊠A □E	B □C □D □ F		
Overall Gr	ade: ⊠A □E	B □C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: ⊠ No □ Yes	
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood Development: □ Poor □ None	;
N	30	9	Foliage Density ⊠ Normal ☐ Sparse)
NE			Weak crotches: ⊠ No ☐ Yes	
E	30	20	Oak Pit Scale: No Yes	
SE			Mainstem dieback: ⊠ No ☐ Yes	
S	30	20	Exposed Roots:	
SW			Epicormic growth	
W	25	15	Shading Out	
NW			Cavities: None	I
			Exfoliating Bark:	
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	60	Water Pocket(s): ⊠ No ☐ Yes	
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage: ☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	I
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls: ⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus: No Yes	
Remove Deadwood:		☐ Yes ☐ No	Vigor: ☐ Excellent ☐ Average	е
Support Structure:		☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Fair ☐ Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			Twig/ Branch □ None ☑ Minor Dieback: □ Moderate □ Extensive	
In Impacted Area: ☐ Yes ☐ No		□ No	Leaf Size ⊠ Normal ☐ Small	
Proposed Land Use: Grading			Heart Rot ⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Impacts: Removal			Borers/ Ants	e

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #223 and #1226. Previous tag #4361 only remaining tag as of 11-21-06 — all other tags removed. Included bark. Retagged by LDC 11-21-06.

Exudations:

No □ Yes

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 11/11/04		Tree Number: 134		
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3			
Species:	Q. agrifolia	_Q. lobataX_ Other	Health Rating¹: ☐A ☐B- ☐C ☐D ☐ F		
Q. berberio	difolia		Form: symmetric	minor asymmetry	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 7 Heigh	t : 15'	☐ major asymn	netry stump sprout	
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 4.5", 4.5", 6",	5", 3", 6", 5"	stag-head		
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 100		Crown Class ² : 🛛 Decu	rrent 🛛 Excurrent	
Existing T	errain: 🗌 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: 🛛 immature	semi-mature	
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A ⊠E	B □C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐	over-mature/senescent	
Overall Gr	ade: □A ⊠B	B □C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	Yes	
CANODY			TREE LIE AL TU		
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS	0	TREE HEALTH		
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	I III	Excellent Average None	
N	9	10	Foliage Density	Normal □ Sparse	
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Е	12	4	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes	
S	15	6	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes	
W	17	5	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes	
NW			Cavities:	□ Trunk □ Branch	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	29	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		xcellent Average	
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No		fair ☐ Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None ☐ Minor Moderate ⊠Extensive		
In Impacted	d Area: 🛛 Yes	□ No	Leaf Size	Normal □ Small	
Proposed L	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
Impacts: Removal			Minor		
Mitigations	: See Oak Tree Repo	rt	Exudations:	⊠ No □ Yes	
Comments	& Notes: Previously to	agged #785 Fire damage	Retagged by LDC 11-21-0	6 Near large packrat	

midden.

 $^{^{1}}$ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species): A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	Date: 11/11/04 Tree Number: 136			
GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS	 S		
Species:	Q. agrifolia X	Q. lobata Other	Health Rating¹: □A ⊠I	B- C D F
			Form: Symmetric S	minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 2 Heigh	t: 28'	☐ major asymm	etry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 18", 15"		☐ stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 100		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decurr	rent 🛛 Excurrent
Existing To	errain: 🛛 F	at Slope	Age Class: immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A ⊠E	B C D F	⊠ mature □o	ver-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: □A ⊠E	- □C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No [☐ Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood ☐ Ex Development: ☐ Po	ccellent
N	28	11	Foliage Density	Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Е	30	8	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	⊠ No □ Yes
S	32	11	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	23	5	Shading Out	⊠ No ☐ Yes
NW			Cavities:	□ Trunk □ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	60	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	J-	xcellent
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	⊠ Fa	air Door
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			_	one ⊠ Minor oderate □Extensive
In Impacted Area: ⊠ Yes □ No		Leaf Size	Normal □ Small	
Proposed L	and Use: Slope		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Impacts: Removal			Borers/ Ants	finor Moderate tensive

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #1225 and #761 (as of 11-21-06 only remaining tag was #761). Beetle holes, located within drainage, trunk has been spray painted, and debris. Retagged by LDC 11-21-06.

Exudations:

No □ Yes

Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date: 11/11/04			Tree	Number: 137	
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3			
Species:	Q. agrifolia	_Q. lobataX_ Other	Health Rating¹: □A ⊠B- □C □D □ F		
Q. berberio	difolia		Form: Symmetric S	minor asymmetry	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 2 Heigh	t: 20'	☐ major asymm	etry stump sprout	
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 8.5", 9"		☐ stag-head		
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 100		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decurr	rent 🛛 Excurrent	
Existing T	errain: 🛛 🗀 F	at Slope	Age Class: immature	⊠ semi-mature	
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A ⊠E	B □C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐o	ver-mature/senescent	
Overall Gr	ade: □A ⊠E	B □C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No [Yes	
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH		
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		xcellent	
N	14	7	Foliage Density	Normal □ Sparse	
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
E	16	6	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SE			Mainstem dieback:	□ No ⊠ Yes	
S	19	6	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes	
W	13	6	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes	
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No □ Yes	
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	33	Water Pocket(s):	☐ No Yes	
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	J	xcellent Average	
Support Structure:			air 🔲 Poor		
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			one ⊠ Minor oderate □Extensive		
In Impacted Area: ⊠ Yes □ No		Leaf Size	⊠ Normal □ Small		
Proposed L	Land Use: Slope		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
Impacts: Removal			Borers/ Ants	Minor Moderate	

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #762. Lots of sprouts at base, one small dead trunk, fire damage, and it is spray painted. LDC tag gone as of 11-21-06; retagged on same date. More tree-like structure.

Exudations:

No ☐ Yes

Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 11/16/04		Tree Numb	er: 141
GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	X_Q. agrifolia	Q. lobata Other	Health Rating¹: □A □B □C	C ⊠D □ F
			Form: symmetric mino	r asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 43 Heigl	nt: 45'		stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 32", 25", 11"		stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 100		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decurrent	
Existing T	errain: 🔲 F	at 🛚 Slope	Age Class: ☐ immature ☐ sem	ni-mature
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A □E	B □C 図D □ F		ture/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 E	B □C 図D □ F	Heritage Tree: ⊠ No ☐ Yes	;
0411071/4				
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood ☐ Excellent ☐ Poor	t ☐ Average ☐ None
N	25	20	Foliage Density	rmal 🗌 Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	o ⊠ Yes
Е	31	3	Oak Pit Scale:	Yes 🗌
SE			Mainstem dieback: ☐ No	o ⊠ Yes
S	24	6	Exposed Roots:	Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	o ⊠ Yes
W	26	6	Shading Out	Yes 🗌
NW			Cavities:	unk 🛚 Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	o ⊠ Yes
CANOPY S	SPREAD (FEET):	57	Water Pocket(s):	o ⊠ Yes
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	ınk 🗌 Branch
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	o 🗌 Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	o ⊠ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Vigor: Excellent	
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Fair	☐ Poor
IMPACTS	& MITIGATIONS		Twig/ Branch ☐ None ☐ Moderate	☐ Minor e ☐Extensive
In Impacted	d Area:	⊠ No	Leaf Size 🛛 No	ormal Small
Proposed I	and Use: N/A		Heart Rot	o 🏻 Yes

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #214. Fire damage, tree trunk is split and hollow, beetle holes, and east side scaffold branch is leaning o the ground.

Borers/ Ants

Exudations:

/Termites

□ Extensive

No ☐ Yes

☐ Moderate

Impacts: None

Mitigations:

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date: 11/16/04	Tree Number:	143

GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS	3			
Species:Q. agrifoliaQ. lobataX Other Health Rating¹: □A □B ☑C+ □D □ F				□B ⊠C+ □D □ F	
Q. berberio	difolia		Form: ⊠ symmetric ☐ minor asymmetry		
Trunk Cou	ınt: 10 Heig	ht : 15'	☐ major asyr	nmetry stump sprout	
Trunk DBH	<mark>ዘ (in.):</mark> 5.5", 4", 3", 4",	3.5", 6", 5", 6", 5", 3.5"	☐ stag-head		
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 90		Crown Class ² : 🛛 Dec	current	
Existing To	errain: 🗌 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: 🛛 immatu	re 🗌 semi-mature	
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A □E	B ⊠C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐	over-mature/senescent	
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	S ⊠C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: 🛛 No	Yes	
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH		
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood Development:] Excellent ☐ Average ☐ Poor ☐ None	
N	15	0	Foliage Density		
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes	
E	19	6	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes	
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes	
S	15	3	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes	
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes	
W	13	5	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes	
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ⊠ Branch	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No □ Yes	
CANOPY S	SPREAD (FEET):	32	Water Pocket(s):	☐ No Yes	
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No □ Yes	
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Vigor:	Excellent Average	
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No] Fair ☐ Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS		Twig/ Branch Dieback:	None Minor Moderate Extensive		
In Impacted Area: ☐ Yes ☐ No		Leaf Size	☐ Normal ☒ Small		
Proposed L	and Use: Grading		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
Impacts: R	Removal		Borers/ Ants /Termites	Minor Moderate Extensive	
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report			Exudations:	⊠ No □ Yes	

Comments & Notes: Woodrat's nest.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead ² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader. ³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 11/16/04		Tree	Number: 144
GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifolia	_Q. lobataX Other	Health Rating¹: □A □	B □C ⊠D □ F
Q. berberio	lifolia		Form: Symmetric S	minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 4 Heigh	t: 10'	☐ major asymm	etry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	ժ (in.)։ 7", 2.5", 2", 9	.5"	☐ stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 90		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decuri	rent
Existing T	errain: 🗌 Fi	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature	
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A □E	B ⊠C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐o	ver-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: □A □B	B ⊠C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No [Yes
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
CANOFIC	Dripline Radius	Canopy to Grade		xcellent
	(Feet)	(Feet)		oor None
N	10	2	Foliage Density	☐ Normal ⊠ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes
Е	12	8	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes
S	10	6	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	0	0	Shading Out	⊠ No ☐ Yes
NW			Cavities:	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	20	Water Pocket(s):	☐ No Yes
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Vigor: □ E □ F	xcellent Average
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No		air 🔲 Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			one ☐ Minor loderate ⊠Extensive	
In Impacted	d Area: 🛛 Yes	☐ No	Leaf Size	
Proposed L	and Use: Grading		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Impacts: R	Removal			Minor
Mitigations	: See Oak Tree Repo	rt	Exudations:	No □ Yes □

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #162. On the edge of the slope with one dead trunk.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species): A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 11/16/04		Tree Number: 145		
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3			
Species:	Q. agrifolia	_Q. lobataX Other	Health Rating¹: ☐A ☐B ☐C ☑D ☐ F		
Q. berberio	difolia		Form: ⊠ symmetric ☐ minor asymmetry		
Trunk Cou	ınt: 13 Heig	ht : 20'	☐ major asymmetry ☐ stump sprou	ıt	
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 6", 6", 6.5", 5	", 4"(4), 5.5"(2), 3.5"(3)	stag-head		
Percent C	anopy Cover: 50		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decurrent ☐ Excurrent		
Existing T	errain: 🔲 F	lat 🛛 Slope	Age Class: ⊠ immature □ semi-mature		
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square E	B □C ☑D □ F	☐ mature ☐over-mature/senescer	nt	
Overall Gr	ade: □A □E	B □C 図D □ F	Heritage Tree: ⊠ No □ Yes		
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH		
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood Development: □ Excellent □ Average □ Poor □ None	је	
N	13	5	Foliage Density ☐ Normal ☒ Spars	se	
NE			Weak crotches: ☐ No ☒ Yes		
Е	12	15	Oak Pit Scale:		
SE			Mainstem dieback: ☐ No ☒ Yes		
S	15	5	Exposed Roots:		
SW			Epicormic growth		
W	15	2	Shading Out		
NW			Cavities:	h	
			Exfoliating Bark:		
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	28	Water Pocket(s): ☐ No ☐ Yes		
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage: ☐ Trunk ☐ Brand	:h	
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls: ⊠ No ☐ Yes		
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:		
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Vigor: ☐ Excellent ☐ Avera	-	
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	⊠ Fair ⊔ Poor		
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			Twig/ Branch ☐ None ☐ Minor ☐ Dieback: ☐ Moderate ☐ Extensiv	е	
In Impacted Area: ⊠ Yes □ No		☐ No	Leaf Size ⊠ Normal ☐ Sma	all	
Proposed I	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot ☐ No ☑ Yes		
Impacts: Removal			Borers/ Ants	ate	

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #181. Fire damage, several deal trunks, and woodrat's nest.

Exudations:

No
 □ Yes

Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species): A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 11/16/04		Tree	Number: 150	
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3			
Species:	Q. agrifolia	_Q. lobataX Other	Health Rating¹: □A □B ⊠C □D □ F		
Q. berberidifolia			Form: Symmetric S	minor asymmetry	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 3 Heigh	t: 15'	☐ major asymm	etry stump sprout	
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 5", 5", 7"		stag-head		
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 90		Crown Class²: ☐ Decur	rent 🛛 Excurrent	
Existing T	errain:	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: ⊠ immature	semi-mature	
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square E	B ⊠C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐o	ver-mature/senescent	
Overall Gr	rade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	B ⊠C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	Yes	
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH		
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood ☐ E Development: ☐ P	xcellent	
N	15	12	Foliage Density	⊠ Normal □ Sparse	
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Е	10	12	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes	
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes	
S	0	0	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes	
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes	
W	12	12	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes	
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	22	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	9	xcellent \(\sum \text{Average} \)	
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	□ No □ Fair □ Poor		
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			one ☐ Minor loderate ⊠Extensive		
In Impacted Area: ⊠ Yes □ No		Leaf Size			
Proposed I	Land Use: Slope		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
Impacts: Removal				Minor	

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #95. Fire damage.

Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report

Exudations:

No
 □ Yes

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species): A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date: 11/17/04		1	ree N	umber	: 15	52
GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS						
	 _ 1	_				

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS					
Species:Q. agrifoliaX_Q. lobata Other			Health Rating¹: ☐A ☐B ☐C ☑D ☐ F		
			Form: ⊠ symmetric ☐ minor asymmetry		
Trunk Cou	ınt: 1 Heigh	t: 25'	☐ major asymn	netry stump sprout	
Trunk DBH	H (in.): 12"		stag-head		
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 50		Crown Class ² : ☐ Decur	rrent 🛛 Excurrent	
Existing To	errain: 🔲 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature		
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square E	B □C 図D □ F	☐ mature ☐ c	over-mature/senescent	
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 E	B □C 図D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes	
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH		
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	·	Excellent	
N	5	7	Foliage Density	☐ Normal ⊠ Sparse	
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes	
Е	7	14	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes	
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes	
S	0	0	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes	
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes	
W	0	0	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes	
NW			Cavities:	□ Trunk □ Branch	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No □ Yes	
CANOPY S	SPREAD (FEET):	7	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No □ Yes	
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No □ Yes	
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		xcellent Average	
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	<u></u>	Fair 🛮 Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None ☐ Minor Moderate ⊠Extensive		
In Impacted Area: ☐ Yes ☐ No			Leaf Size	Normal □ Small	
Proposed Land Use: Slope			Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
Impacts: R	Removal			Minor	
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report			Exudations:	No	

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #168 and #1222. Fire damage and most of the tree is dead with few live leaves.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species): A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date: 11/17/04	Tree Number:	153

GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species: _	Q. agrifoliaX	Q. lobata Other	Health Rating¹: □A [⊠B □C □D □ F
			Form: symmetric	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 2 Heigh	t: 25'	☐ major asym	metry stump sprout
Trunk DBH	H (in.): 10", 14"		stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 80		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Dec	urrent Excurrent
Existing T	errain: 🛛 🖂 F	at Slope	Age Class: immatur	e 🛮 semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A ⊠B	B □C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐	over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: □A ⊠B	B □C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood Development:	Excellent
N	16	11	Foliage Density	⊠ Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes
E	17	14	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No ⊠ Yes
S	22	6	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	16	15	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes
NW			Cavities:	□ Trunk □ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No □ Yes
CANOPY S	SPREAD (FEET):	38	Water Pocket(s):	☐ No Yes
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No □ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Vigor:	Excellent
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Fair
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS		Twig/ Branch Dieback:	None	
In Impacted Area: ☐ Yes ☐ No		Leaf Size	□ Small □ Small	
Proposed Land Use: Grading			Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Impacts: R	Removal		Borers/ Ants	Minor
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report			Exudations:	⊠ No □ Yes

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #170 and #1224.

Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead
 Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.
 Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree - F = Dead

Survey Date	Survey Date: 11/17/04 Tree Number: 154			154	
GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS	3			
Species:	Q. agrifolia	_Q. lobataX Other	Health Rating¹: □A □	в □с ⊠	d □ F
Q. berberio	difolia	Form: symmetric	 ☑ minor asy	mmetry	
Trunk Cou	unt: 1 Heigh	t: 20'	☐ major asymm	etry stu	mp sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 10"		☐ stag-head		
Percent C	anopy Cover: 25		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decurr	rent 🔲 Ex	xcurrent
Existing T	errain: 🔲 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature	⊠ semi-ma	iture
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square E	B □C 図D □ F	☐ mature ☐o	ver-mature/	senescent
Overall Gr	rade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	B □C 図D □ F	Heritage Tree: No [Yes	
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH		
0,41011	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood Ex		☐ Average ☑ None
N	14	10	Foliage Density	☐ Normal	⊠ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No	☐ Yes
Е	12	11	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No	☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No	⊠ Yes
S	9	7	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No	☐ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	□ No	⊠ Yes
W	15	6	Shading Out	⊠ No	☐ Yes
NW			Cavities:	□ Trunk	Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	☐ No	⊠ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	27	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No	☐ Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk	Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No	☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations <i>:</i>	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No	☐ Yes
Remove Deadwood:				Average	
Support Structure:			air	⊠ Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			one ☐ loderate ⊠	Minor Extensive	
In Impacte	d Area: 🛛 Yes	□ No	Leaf Size	□ Normal	☐ Small
Proposed Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot		X Yes	

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #154. One dead trunk.

Impacts: Removal

Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report

Borers/ Ants

Exudations:

/Termites

□ Extensive

No ☐ Yes

☐ Moderate

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	Survey Date: 11/17/04 Tree Number: 155			Number: 155
GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifolia	_Q. lobataX Other	Health Rating¹: □A □	B □C 図D □ F
Q. berberio	difolia		Form: symmetric [minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 3 Heigh	t: 20'	⊠ major asymm	netry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 6", 6.5", 10"		stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 40		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decur	rent 🛛 Excurrent
Existing T	errain: 🗌 Fi	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: 🛛 immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square E	B ⊠C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐ c	over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	B ⊠C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	1 =	excellent
N	10	11	Foliage Density	Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	☐ No Yes
Е	15	12	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes
S	5	13	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	8	8	Shading Out	⊠ No ☐ Yes
NW			Cavities:	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	23	Water Pocket(s):	☐ No Yes
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	-	excellent Average
Support Structure:		⊠ F	air	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			lone ☐ Minor loderate ⊠Extensive	
In Impacted Area: ☐ Yes ☐ No		Leaf Size	Normal □ Small	
Proposed L	and Use: Grading		Heart Rot	☐ No ☒ Yes
Impacts: F	Removal		I =	Minor Moderate Moderate
Mitigations	· See Oak Tree Reno	rt	Exudations:	□ No ⊠ Yes

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #155. Fire damage, woodrat's nest, and lots of broken trunks and branches. Extensive grading activity surrounds the tree and occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	Survey Date: 11/17/04 Tree Number: 156				
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3			
Species:	Q. agrifolia	_Q. lobata <u>X</u> Other	Health Rating ¹ :]B ⊠C- □D □ F	
Q. berberio	difolia		Form: symmetric		
Trunk Cou	ınt: 8 Heigh	t: 18'	☐ major asymi	metry stump sprout	
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 3", 6", 3.5", 5	", 3.5", 2", 3.5", 6.5"	stag-head		
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 75		Crown Class ² : Decu	rrent 🛛 Excurrent	
Existing T	errain: 🗌 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: 🛛 immature	semi-mature	
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square E	B ⊠C- □D □ F	☐ mature ☐	over-mature/senescent	
Overall Gr	ade: □A □B	B ⊠C- □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes	
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH		
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		Excellent	
N	10.5	7	Foliage Density		
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes	
Е	12	11	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes	
S	13.5	3	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes	
W	12	8	Shading Out	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
NW			Cavities:	□ Trunk □ Branch □	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	24	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	⊠ Trunk ⊠ Branch	
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No □ Yes	
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	_ ···3···	Excellent Average	
Support Structure:		N N	Fair ∐ Poor		
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None ☐ Minor Moderate ☑Extensive		
In Impacted Area: ⊠ Yes □ No		Leaf Size			
Proposed I	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	□ No ⊠ Yes	
Impacts: F	Removal			Minor	
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report		Exudations:	No □ Yes		

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #157. Fire damage, and some trunks are split and hollow. Extensive grading activity surrounds the tree and occurred between 11/04 and 11/06. New mechanical damage within past 2 years.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date: 11/17/04

LDC Project No: 97001-011

Troe Number: 157

Survey Date	;. 11/11/0 4	1166	Nulliber. 137		
GENERAL	GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS				
Species:	Q. agrifolia	_Q. lobataX_ Other	Health Rating¹: □A □	B ⊠C- □D □ F	
Q. berberio	lifolia		Form: Symmetric S	minor asymmetry	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 1 Heigh	t: 18'	☐ major asymm	etry stump sprout	
Trunk DBI	l (in.): 8.5"		stag-head		
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 80		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decur	rent	
Existing T	errain: 🔲 F	at 🛚 Slope	Age Class: ⊠ immature	semi-mature	
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A □E	B ⊠C □D □ F	☐ mature ☐o	ver-mature/senescent	
Overall Gr	ade: □A □E	B ⊠C- □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No [Yes	
CANODY	NIAD A OTEDIOTION		TREE LIE AL TIL		
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS	0	TREE HEALTH		
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood ☐ E Development: ☐ P	xcellent	
N	11	3	Foliage Density	Normal □ Sparse	
NE			Weak crotches:	☐ No Yes	
Е	11	8	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes	
S	16	2	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes	
W	10.5	6	Shading Out	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
NW			Cavities:	□ Trunk □ Branch	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	27	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		xcellent Average	
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fi	air 🔲 Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS		_	one ☐ Minor loderate ⊠Extensive		
In Impacted Area: ⊠ Yes □ No		Leaf Size			
Proposed L	and Use: Grading		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
Impacts: R	Removal			Minor Moderate Moderate	
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report			Exudations:	No	

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #158. Fire damage. Extensive grading activity surrounds the tree and occurred between 11/04 and 11/06. Resprouting around base.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species): A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	Survey Date: 11/17/04 Tree Number: 158			Number: 158
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifolia X	Q. lobata Other	Health Rating¹: □A □	B ⊠C- □D □ F
-			Form: symmetric [minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 2 Heigh	t: 35'		netry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 18", 12"		stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 70		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decur	rent
Existing T	errain:	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square B	B ⊠C- □D □ F	⊠ mature □c	over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	S ⊠C- □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS	T	TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood ☐ E Development: ☐ P	xcellent Average None
N	10	12	Foliage Density	Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	☐ No Yes
Е	12	8	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes
S	20	1	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	13	25	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes
NW			Cavities:	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	30	Water Pocket(s):	☐ No Yes
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		xcellent Average
Support Structure:		⊠ F	air Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			lone	
In Impacted Area: ☐ Yes ☒ No		Leaf Size		
Proposed L	Land Use: N/A		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Impacts: None				Minor

Comments & Notes: Moss on the tree and next to broken concrete structures. Lots of debris.

Exudations:

No ☐ Yes

Mitigations:

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species): A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 11/17/04		Tree	Number: 159
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifolia X	Q. lobata Other	Health Rating¹: □A □]B ⊠C □D □ F
			Form: symmetric	minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 4 Heigh	t: 35'	☐ major asymn	netry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 19.5", 17", 20	", 12"	☐ stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 85		Crown Class ² : Decui	rrent 🛛 Excurrent
Existing T	errain: 🛛 F	at Slope	Age Class: immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square E	B ⊠C □D □ F	⊠ mature □	over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	B ⊠C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood ☐ E Development: ☐ F	Excellent Average
N	24	30	Foliage Density	⊠ Normal ☐ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes
Е	18	25	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes
S	25	20	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	10	12	Shading Out	⊠ No ☐ Yes
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	49	Water Pocket(s):	☐ No Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	☐ No ☒ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Excellent Average
Support Structure:			Fair Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None	
In Impacted Area: Yes No		Leaf Size	Normal □ Small	
Proposed Land Use: N/A		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
Impacts: N	None		_	Minor
Mitigations	:		Exudations:	No □ Yes ■ Yes

Comments & Notes: Lots of trash, moss on tree, fire damage, and lots of dead branches.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species): A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 11/17/04		Tree Number	r: 160
GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS)		
Species:	X_Q. agrifolia	Q. lobata Other	Health Rating¹: □A ☑B+ □C	D D F
			Form: ☐ symmetric ☐ minor a	asymmetry
Trunk Cou	unt: 1 Height:	25'	major asymmetry :	stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 8"		☐ stag-head	
Percent C	anopy Cover: 100		Crown Class ² : ☐ Decurrent ⊠	Excurrent
Existing T	errain: 🔲 FI	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: ⊠ immature ☐ semi-	mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : □A ⊠B	+	☐ mature ☐over-matu	re/senescent
Overall Gr	rade: □A ⊠B	+	Heritage Tree: ⊠ No ☐ Yes	
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood ⊠ Excellent ☐ Poor	☐ Average ☐ None
N	10	12	Foliage Density	nal 🗌 Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	☐ Yes
Е	5	4	Oak Pit Scale:	☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback: ☐ No	
S	10	12	Exposed Roots:	☐ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	
W	10	0	Shading Out 🖂 No	☐ Yes
NW			Cavities: None	nk 🗌 Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	20	Water Pocket(s):	☐ Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	k 🗌 Branch
Monitor for Progress: ☐ Yes ☐ No		Canker/Galls:	☐ Yes	
Treat Infestations: ☐ Yes ☐ No Fungus: ☒ No		☐ Yes		
Remove Deadwood:		Vigor: Excellent	⊠Average	
Support S	Structure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Fair ☐ Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS		Twig/ Branch	Minor ☐Extensive	

Leaf Size

Heart Rot

/Termites
Exudations:

Borers/ Ants

Comments & Notes:

In Impacted Area:

Impacts: None

Mitigations:

Proposed Land Use: N/A

☑ No

☐ Yes

☐ Moderate

⊠ No

No ☐ Yes

Extensive

☐ Yes

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	Survey Date: 11/17/04 Tree Number: 161			Number: 161
GENERAL	_ CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifolia X	Q. lobata Other	Health Rating¹: □A ⊠	B+ □C □D □ F
			Form: Symmetric [minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	unt: 1 Heigh	t : 50'	☐ major asymm	etry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 32"		stag-head	
Percent C	anopy Cover: 95		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decur	rent
Existing T	errain: 🖂 FI	at 🗌 Slope	Age Class: immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : ⊠A □B	B □C □D □ F		ver-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	rade: ⊠A □B	C D F	Heritage Tree: No [Yes
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		xcellent
N	25	20	Foliage Density	Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes
Е	25	12	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
S	28	20	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	28	2	Shading Out	⊠ No ☐ Yes
NW			Cavities: None	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	53	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infe	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove Deadwood: Yes No			xcellent	
Support S	Structure:	☐ Yes ☐ No		
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS		Twig/ Branch NDieback:	one	
In Impacted Area: Yes No		Leaf Size	□ Normal □ Small	
Proposed	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Impacts: Encroachment			Borers/ Ants	Minor Moderate Moderate

Comments & Notes: Included bark and lots of debris around the tree.

Exudations:

No □ Yes

Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species): A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 11/17/04		Tree	Number: 162
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS)		
Species:	Q. agrifoliaX	Q. lobata Other	Health Rating¹: □A ⊠	ß+ □C □D □F
			Form: symmetric	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 41 Heigh	nt: 55'	☐ major asymn	netry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 45"		☐ stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 90		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decu	rrent 🛛 Excurrent
Existing T	errain: 🛛 F	at 🗌 Slope	Age Class: immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \boxtimes B	3+	⊠ mature □	over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	rade: □A ⊠B	C D F	Heritage Tree: No	
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
- CANCEL TO	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood	Excellent 🛛 Average
N	22	40	Foliage Density	Normal ☐ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes
Е	34	45	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
S	40	24	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	37	32	Shading Out	⊠ No ☐ Yes
NW			Cavities: None	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No □ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	71	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No □ Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	<u> </u>	Excellent Average
Support Structure:			Fair Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None ⊠ Minor Moderate □Extensive	
In Impacted Area: Yes No		Leaf Size		
Proposed I	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Impacts: F	Removal		I ==	Minor
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report		Exudations:	☐ No ☐ Yes	

Comments & Notes: Located on the site along Henry Mayo Drive. Protective fencing around the tree and included bark.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species): A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date: 11/17/04

LDC Project No: 97001-011

Troe Number: 163

Survey Date	E. 11/17/04		116	e Number. 103
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS			
Species:	Q. agrifoliaX	Q. lobata Other	Health Rating¹: □A □	ß □C □D □F
			Form: symmetric	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 2 Heigh	t: 30'	major asymi	metry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 23", 16.5"		☐ stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 75		Crown Class ² : Decu	ırrent 🛛 Excurrent
Existing T	errain: 🔲 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature	e 🗌 semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A ⊠E	B C D F		over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🖾 B	B □C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		Excellent Average Poor None
N	14	22	Foliage Density	Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Е	22	10	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No ⊠ Yes
S	12	20	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No ⊠ Yes
W	20	35	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	42	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Excellent Average
Support Structure:			Fair Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None ⊠ Minor Moderate □Extensive	
In Impacted Area: ☐ Yes ☐ No		Leaf Size		
Proposed L	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	⊠ No □ Yes
Impacts: F	Removal			Minor
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report			Exudations:	No □ Yes □

Comments & Notes: 11-21-06 NOTE: TREE HAS BEEN REMOVED. Tree not yet permitted for removal.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species): A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	Survey Date: 11/17/04 Tree Number: 164			
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifolia	Q. lobata X Other	Health Rating¹: ☐A ☐B ☐C ☐D ☐ F	
Q. berberio	difolia		Form: Symmetric	minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 10 Heigh	nt: 12'	☐ major asymr	metry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 6"(3), 5"(3), 5	.5", 4.5"(3)	☐ stag-head	
Percent C	anopy Cover: 100		Crown Class ² : Decu	rrent 🛛 Excurrent
Existing T	errain: 🔲 Fl	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: 🛛 immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square B	B □C 図D □ F	☐ mature ☐	over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	rade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	B □C 図D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	Yes
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		Excellent
N	12	10	Foliage Density	☐ Normal ⊠ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Е	15	10	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes
S	10	3	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	8	6	Shading Out	⊠ No ☐ Yes
NW			Cavities: None	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	23	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	· · · · · ·	Excellent Average
Support Structure:		⊠ F	Fair ∐ Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None ☐ Minor Moderate ☑Extensive	
In Impacted Area: Yes No		Leaf Size		
Proposed I	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	⊠ No □ Yes
Impacts: F	Removal			Minor
Mitigations	See Oak Tree Reno	rt	Exudations:	M No □ Yes

Comments & Notes: Fire damage. Located near existing fence. Extensive grading activity surrounds the tree and occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date: 11/17/04				Number: 165
GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifolia <u>X</u>	Q. lobata Other	Health Rating¹: ☐A ☐B ☐C ☒D ☐ F	
			Form: Symmetric	minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 1 Heigh	t : 20'	☐ major asymm	etry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 12"		stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 20		Crown Class ² : Decur	rent 🛛 Excurrent
Existing T	errain: 🗌 FI	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A □B	B □C 図D □ F	⊠ mature □o	ver-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	B □C ☑D □ F	Heritage Tree: No [Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood Development: □ E	xcellent Average Oor None
N	5	15	Foliage Density	☐ Normal ⊠ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Е	12	20	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes
S	5	12	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	10	10	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes
NW			Cavities:	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	22	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		xcellent Average
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	⊠ Fa	air 🔲 Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			one ☐ Minor loderate ⊠Extensive	
In Impacted Area: ⊠ Yes □ No		Leaf Size	□ Small □ Small	
Proposed Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
Impacts: Removal				Minor Moderate ktensive

Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report No
 □ Yes Comments & Notes: Bees in the tree. There is grading activity around the oak and it occurred between 11/04 and 11/06.

Exudations:

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date: 11/17/04			Tree	Number: 166
GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS				
Species:	Q. agrifoliaX	Q. lobata Other	Health Rating¹: □A □]B ⊠C- □D □ F
	-		Form: symmetric	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 1 Heigh	t: 35'	☐ major asymn	netry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 32.5"		☐ stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 90		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decur	rrent
Existing T	errain: 🗌 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square E	B ⊠C □D □ F	⊠ mature □c	over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	B ⊠C- □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		Excellent
N	15	30	Foliage Density	⊠ Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Е	26	24	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes
S	32	6	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	20	20	Shading Out	⊠ No ☐ Yes
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	47	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Excellent Average
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No		fair Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None	
In Impacted Area: Yes No		Leaf Size	Normal □ Small	
Proposed I	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Impacts: F	Removal			Minor
Mitigations	: See Oak Tree Repo	rt	Exudations:	No □ Yes ■ Yes

Comments & Notes: Broken scaffold branches to the south side and trunk base damaged.

Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species): A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree - F = Dead

Survey Dat	e: 11/17/04		Т	ree Number: 167
GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS	•		
Species:	Q. agrifolia X	Q. lobata Other	Health Rating¹: □A	□B ⊠C □D □ F
			Form: symmetric	minor asymmetry
Trunk Co	unt: 1 Heigh	t : 28'	☐ major asyı	mmetry stump sprout
Trunk DB	H (in.): 21"		☐ stag-head	
Percent C	anopy Cover: 65		Crown Class ² : De	current 🛚 Excurrent
Existing T	Terrain: 🗌 FI	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immatu	re 🗌 semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square B	S ⊠C □D □ F	☐ mature [over-mature/senescent
Overall G	rade: □A □B	⊠C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	o 🗌 Yes
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood Development:	☐ Excellent ☐ Average ☐ Poor ☐ None
N	5	4	Foliage Density	Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	☐ No Yes
E	9	6	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	⊠ No □ Yes
S	15	6	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	14	15	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes
NW			Cavities: None	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	23	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No □ Yes
Treat Infestations:		Fungus:	⊠ No □ Yes	
Remove Deadwood:		Vigor:	Excellent Average	
Support S	Structure:	☐ Yes ☐ No		∏ Fair ☐ Poor
IMPACTS	& MITIGATIONS		Twig/ Branch Dieback:	None ☐ Minor ☐ Moderate ☐ Extensive
In Impacted Area: X Yes No		Leaf Size		

Comments & Notes: Next to fence and brown leaves.

Proposed Land Use: Grading

Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report

Impacts: Removal

Heart Rot

/Termites
Exudations:

Borers/ Ants

No

No
 □ Yes

☐ Extensive

☐ Yes

☐ Moderate

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date: 11/17/04

LDC Project No: <u>97001-011</u>

Troe Number: 169

Survey Date	E. 11/17/04		110	e Number. 100
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifoliaX	Q. lobata Other	Health Rating¹: □A □	B ⊠C+ □D □ F
			Form: symmetric	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 1 Heigh	it: 35'	☐ major asym	metry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 28"		stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 95		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decu	ırrent 🛛 Excurrent
Existing T	errain: 🔲 F	lat 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature	e 🗌 semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A ⊠E	B C D F		over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲A 🖾 🛭	B □C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS	I	TREE HEALTH	🖼 .
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		Excellent Average Poor None
N	15	16	Foliage Density	
NE			Weak crotches:	☐ No Yes
Е	26	13	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes
S	24	4	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	25	2	Shading Out	⊠ No ☐ Yes
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	51	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Excellent Average
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Fair Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None	
In Impacted Area: ⊠ Yes □ No		Leaf Size		
Proposed L	Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Impacts: F	Removal			Minor
Mitigations	: See Oak Tree Repo	rt	Exudations:	No □ Yes

Comments & Notes: Previously tagged #50. Fire damage, lots of dead branches, sprouts, couple of dead trunks, and hollow all the way up through the trunk.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date: 11/17/04	Tree Number:	169

GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS	3			
Species: _	Q. agrifolia <u>X</u>	Q. lobata Other	Health Rating¹: □A □	⊠B □C □D □ F	
			Form: Symmetric	Form: ⊠ symmetric ☐ minor asymmetry	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 1 Heigh	t: 35'	☐ major asym	metry stump sprout	
Trunk DBH	l (in.): 26"		☐ stag-head		
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 85		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decu	urrent	
Existing T	errain: 🗌 FI	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature	e 🗌 semi-mature	
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A ⊠B	B □C □D □ F	⊠ mature □	over-mature/senescent	
Overall Gr	ade: □A ⊠B	B □C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes	
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH		
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	_	Excellent	
N	21	4	Foliage Density	⊠ Normal □ Sparse	
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes	
Е	17	20	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes	
SE			Mainstem dieback:	⊠ No □ Yes	
S	30	3	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes	
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes	
W	24	2	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes	
NW			Cavities: None	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No □ Yes	
CANOPY S	SPREAD (FEET):	51	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No □ Yes	
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No □ Yes	
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Excellent Average	
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Fair Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None ☐ Minor Moderate ☐Extensive		
In Impacted Area: ☐ Yes ☐ No		Leaf Size			
Proposed Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	⊠ No □ Yes		
Impacts: R	Removal			Minor	
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report		Exudations:	⊠ No □ Yes		

Comments & Notes: Fire damage.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species): A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date: 11/17/04	Tree Number:	170

GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:Q. agrifoliaX_Q. lobata Other		Health Rating¹: □A ⊠B □C □D □ F		
			Form: ⊠ symmetric ☐ minor asymmetry	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 1 Heigh	t : 25'	☐ major asyn	nmetry stump sprout
Trunk DBH	l (in.): 21"		☐ stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 75		Crown Class ² : 🛛 Dec	urrent
Existing To	errain: 🗌 F	at 🛚 Slope	Age Class: immatur	e 🗌 semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A ⊠E	B □C □D □ F		over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: □A ⊠E	B □C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: 🛛 No	Yes
CANODY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
CANOPIC		Canany to Crada		Event Average
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood Development:	Excellent Average None
N	15	32	Foliage Density	Normal □ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
E	21	17	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes
S	24	5	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	15	21	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ☒ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No □ Yes
CANOPY S	SPREAD (FEET):	39	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No □ Yes
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Vigor:	ExcellentAverage
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Fair Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS		Twig/ Branch Dieback:	None	
In Impacted Area: ☐ Yes ☐ No		Leaf Size	Normal □ Small	
Proposed Land Use: Grading		Heart Rot	⊠ No □ Yes	
Impacts: R	Removal		Borers/ Ants	Minor
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report		Exudations:	No Yes	

Comments & Notes: Fire damage.

Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead
 Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.
 Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree - F = Dead

Survey Date: 11/17/04			Tree	Number: 171
GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifolia <u>X</u>	Q. lobata Other	Health Rating¹: ☐A ☐B ☐C ☒D ☐ F	
			Form: symmetric	minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 2 Heigh	t: 30'		etry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 25", 33"		stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 90		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decurr	rent
Existing T	errain: 🗌 Fl	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square B	B □C 図D □ F	⊠ mature □o	ver-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	C ⊠D □F	Heritage Tree: No [Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		xcellent
N	15	20	Foliage Density	⊠ Normal ☐ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes
Е	7	20	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes
S	10	30	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	28	10	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes
NW			Cavities:	□ Trunk □ Branch □
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	35	Water Pocket(s):	☐ No Yes
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		xcellent Average
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	⊠ Fa	air 🔲 Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			one	
In Impacted Area: ⊠ Yes □ No		Leaf Size	Normal □ Small	
Proposed L	and Use: Slope		Heart Rot	☐ No ⊠ Yes
Impacts: Removal			Minor Moderate detensive	

Comments & Notes: Hollow, and one trunk is leaning on the ground. Fire damage.

Exudations:

No □ Yes

Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species): A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date: 11/17/04			Tree	Number: 172	
GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS	3			
Species:	Q. agrifoliaX	Q. lobata Other	Health Rating¹: □A □	B □C 図D □ F	
			Form: symmetric	Form: ☐ symmetric ☒ minor asymmetry	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 2 Heigh	t: 25'	☐ major asymm	netry stump sprout	
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 15", 11.5"		☐ stag-head		
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 100		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decur	rent 🛛 Excurrent	
Existing T	errain: 🔲 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature	semi-mature	
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : \square A \square E	B □C 図D □ F	⊠ mature □c	over-mature/senescent	
Overall Gr	ade: 🔲 A 🔲 B	B □C 図D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes	
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH		
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	1 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	xcellent Average	
N	5	6	Foliage Density	Normal □ Sparse	
NE			Weak crotches:	☐ No Yes	
Е	18	20	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SE			Mainstem dieback:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
S	20	12	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes	
W	25	0	Shading Out	☐ No Yes	
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
CANOPY S	SPREAD (FEET):	43	Water Pocket(s):	☐ No ☐ Yes	
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		xcellent Average	
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No	□ F	air Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			lone ⊠ Minor loderate □Extensive		
In Impacted Area: Yes No		Leaf Size			
Proposed L	and Use: Slope		Heart Rot	⊠ No □ Yes	
Impacts: R	Removal			Minor Moderate Moderate	
Mitigations	: See Oak Tree Repo	rt	Exudations:	No □ Yes	

Comments & Notes: Included bark, lots of dead scaffold branches next to it and lots of beetle holes.

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date: 11/17/04	Tree Number:	173
GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS		

GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS	}		
Species:Q. agrifoliaX_Q. lobata Other		Health Rating¹: □A ⊠B- □C □D □ F		
			Form: ⊠ symmetric ☐ minor asymmetry	
Trunk Cou	ınt: 1 Heigh	t : 25'	☐ major asymr	metry stump sprout
Trunk DBH	H (in.): 21.5"		☐ stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: 95		Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decu	rrent
Existing T	errain: 🗌 Fi	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A ⊠B	C D F	⊠ mature □	over-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: □A ⊠B	- D D F	Heritage Tree: No	Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	_	Excellent 🛮 Average Poor 🔲 None
N	16	11	Foliage Density	
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes
E	12	20	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No □ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:	☐ No Yes
S	15	3	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No □ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	16	6	Shading Out	⊠ No □ Yes
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ⊠ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No □ Yes
CANOPY S	SPREAD (FEET):	31	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No □ Yes
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Excellent Average
Support S	tructure:	☐ Yes ☐ No] <u> </u> [] F	Fair Poor
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			None ⊠ Minor Moderate □Extensive	
In Impacted Area:		Leaf Size	Normal □ Small	
Proposed Land Use: Slope		Heart Rot	⊠ No □ Yes	
Impacts: E	ncroachment			Minor
Mitigations: See Oak Tree Report		Exudations:	☐ No ⊠ Yes	

Comments & Notes: Fire damage; next to fence.

Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead
 Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.
 Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree - F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 1/31/05	1/31/05 Tree Number: 174		
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3		
Species:	Q. agrifoliaX	Q. lobata Other	Health Rating¹: □A ⊠	B- □C □D □ F
			Form: Symmetric	minor asymmetry
Trunk Cou	ınt: 1 Heigh	t: 25'	☐ major asymm	etry stump sprout
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 13.5"		stag-head	
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: * = see	e note below	Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decurr	rent
Existing T	errain: 🗌 F	at 🛚 Slope	Age Class: immature	semi-mature
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : □A ⊠E	3- □C □D □ F		ver-mature/senescent
Overall Gr	ade: □A ⊠B	3- □C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No [Yes
CANOPY (CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH	
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		xcellent
N	18	12	Foliage Density:*	☐ Normal ☐ Sparse
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Е	14	7	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SE			Mainstem dieback:*	□ No □ Yes
S	11	15	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
SW			Epicormic growth	☐ No Yes
W	13	12	Shading Out	⊠ No ☐ Yes
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	29	Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		xcellent
Support Structure:		L) F	air	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS		_	one	
In Impacted Area: Yes No		Leaf Size:*	☐ Normal ☐ Small	
Proposed I	Land Use: N/A		Heart Rot	⊠ No ☐ Yes
Impacts: None		Borers/ Ants	Minor Moderate Moderate	

Mitigations: No
 □ Yes Comments & Notes: * = Survey taken during tree's dormant period; Previously tagged #108; moss on dead branches.

Exudations:

Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead
 Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.
 Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree - F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 1/31/05		Tree Nu	mber: 175		
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3				
Species:Q. agrifoliaX_Q. lobata Other			Health Rating¹: □A ⊠B-	□C □D □ F		
			Form: symmetric minor asymmetry			
Trunk Cou	ınt: 1 Heigh	t: 30'				
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 21"		☐ stag-head			
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: * see r	note below	Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decurrent ☐ Excurrent			
Existing T	errain: 🗌 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: ☐ immature ☐ semi-mature			
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : □A ⊠E	3- □C □D □ F		mature/senescent		
Overall Gr	ade: □A ⊠B	3- □C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: ⊠ No □ `	Yes		
CANOPY CHARACTERISTICS			TREE HEALTH			
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	Wound Wood Excel Development: Poor	lent ☐ Average ☐ None		
N	23	5	Foliage Density:*	Normal 🛛 Sparse		
NE			Weak crotches:	No Yes		
Е	27	4	Oak Pit Scale:	No Yes		
SE			Mainstem dieback:*	No Yes		
S	16	1	Exposed Roots:	No Yes		
SW			Epicormic growth:	No 🛛 Yes		
W	0	0	Shading Out:	No 🛛 Yes		
NW			Cavities:	Trunk Branch		
			Exfoliating Bark:	No Yes		
CANOPY	SPREAD (FEET):	39	Water Pocket(s):	No Yes		
PROPOSED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	Trunk Branch			
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	No Yes		
Treat Infes	stations:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	No Yes		
Remove Deadwood:		☐ Yes ☐ No	Vigor:*	_ ~		
Support Structure:		☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Fair	☐ Poor		
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS		Twig/ Branch ☐ None ☐ Mode	_			
In Impacted Area: ☐ Yes ☒ No		Leaf Size:*	Normal Small			
Proposed Land Use: N/A		Heart Rot: ⊠	No 🗌 Yes			
Impacts: None		Borers/ Ants				
Mitigations:			Fyudations:	No 🗆 Yes		

Comments & Notes: * = Survey taken during tree's dormant period, Previously tagged #107

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species): A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 1/31/05		Tre	e Number: 176	
GENERAL	. CHARACTERISTICS	3			
Species:	Q. agrifoliaX	Q. lobata Other	Health Rating¹: □A ▷	ß- □C □D □ F	
			Form: ☐ symmetric ☐ minor asymmetry		
Trunk Cou	ınt: 1 Heigh	t: 30'	major asymı	metry stump sprout	
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 14.5"		☐ stag-head		
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: * see r	note below	Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decurrent ☐ Excurrent		
Existing T	errain: 🗌 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: ☐ immature ☐ semi-mature		
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : □A ⊠E	3- □C □D □ F			
Overall Gr	ade: □A ⊠B	- □C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	Yes	
CANOPY CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH			
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		Excellent	
N	28	21	Foliage Density:*	☐ Normal ☐ Sparse	
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Е	14	5	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SE			Mainstem dieback:*	□ No □ Yes	
S	13.5	4	Exposed Roots:	☐ No Yes	
SW			Epicormic growth:	☐ No Yes	
W	5	20	Shading Out:	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
CANOPY	CANOPY SPREAD (FEET): 41.5		Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
PROPOSED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch		
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Treat Infestations:		☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Remove D	eadwood:	☐ Yes ☐ No		Excellent	
Support Structure:		<u> </u>	Fair		
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS		0	None ☐ Minor Moderate ☐Extensive		
In Impacted Area: Yes No		Leaf Size:*	☐ Normal ☐ Small		
Proposed Land Use: N/A		Heart Rot:	⊠ No □ Yes		
Impacts: None			Minor		
Mitigations:		Exudations:	No □ Yes		

Comments & Notes: * = Survey taken during tree's dormant period; Previously tagged #106; some broken branches, moss on branches, sunken area at base of trunk on NW side

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 1/31/05		Tree	Number: 177		
GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS						
Species:Q. agrifoliaX_Q. lobata Other			Health Rating¹: □A ☑B □C □D □ F			
			Form: ⊠ symmetric ☐ minor asymmetry			
Trunk Cou	ınt: 1 Heigh	t : 30'	☐ major asymm	☐ major asymmetry ☐ stump sprout		
Trunk DBI	H (in.): 22"		☐ stag-head			
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: * see r	note below	Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decurrent ☐ Excurrent			
Existing T	errain: 🔲 F	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: ☐ immature ☐ semi-mature			
Aesthetic	Rating ³ : □A ⊠E	B □C □D □ F	⊠ mature □c	over-mature/senescent		
Overall Gr	ade: □A ⊠B	B □C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	☐ Yes		
CANOPY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH			
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)		xcellent		
N	14	25	Foliage Density:*	☐ Normal ☐ Sparse		
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes		
Е	26	4	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes		
SE			Mainstem dieback:*	□ No □ Yes		
S	27	3	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes		
SW			Epicormic growth:	☐ No Yes		
W	16	27	Shading Out:	☐ No Yes		
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch		
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes		
CANOPY SPREAD (FEET): 42		Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes			
PROPOSE	ED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch		
Monitor fo	or Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes		
Treat Infestations:		☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes		
Remove Deadwood:		☐ Yes ☐ No		xcellent		
Support Structure:		☐ Yes ☐ No		air		
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS		0	lone			
In Impacted Area: Yes No		Leaf Size:*	☐ Normal ☐ Small			
Proposed Land Use: N/A		Heart Rot:	⊠ No □ Yes			
Impacts: None			Minor			
Mitigations:			Exudations:	No □ Yes		

Comments & Notes: * = Survey taken during tree's dormant period; Previously tagged #105

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species): A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date	e: 1/31/05		Tree	Number: 178	
GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS	3			
Species:	Q. agrifoliaX	Q. lobata Other	Health Rating¹: □A ⊠	B- □C □D □ F	
			Form: ☐ symmetric ☐ minor asymmetry		
Trunk Cou	ınt: 1 Heigh	t: 30'	☐ major asymmetry ☐ stump sprout		
Trunk DBI	l (in.): 20"		☐ stag-head		
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: * see r	note below	Crown Class ² : ⊠ Decurrent ☐ Excurrent		
Existing Terrain:		Age Class: ☐ immature ☐ semi-mature			
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A ⊠E	3- □C □D □ F			
Overall Gr	ade: □A ⊠B	- □C □D □ F	Heritage Tree: No	Yes	
CANOPY CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH			
	Dripline Radius (Feet)	Canopy to Grade (Feet)	_	xcellent	
N	17	18	Foliage Density:*	☐ Normal ☐ Sparse	
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No □ Yes	
Е	21	12	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SE			Mainstem dieback:*	☐ No ☐ Yes	
S	19	13	Exposed Roots:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SW			Epicormic growth:	☐ No ⊠ Yes	
W	28	4	Shading Out:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
CANOPY SPREAD (FEET): 49		Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes		
PROPOSE	D ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Treat Infestations:		☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Remove Deadwood:		☐ Yes ☐ No		xcellent	
Support Structure:		□ Fi	air 🔲 Poor		
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			one		
In Impacted Area: ☐ Yes ☒ No		Leaf Size:*	☐ Normal ☐ Small		
Proposed Land Use: N/A		Heart Rot:	⊠ No □ Yes		
Impacts: None			_	Minor Moderate densive	
Mitigations:			Exudations:	No □ Yes	

Comments & Notes: * = Survey taken during tree's dormant period; Previously tagged #103; some dead branches; large amount of Epicormic growth

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

³ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species): A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

Survey Date: 1/21/05

LDC Project No: <u>97001-011</u>

Troe Number: 170

Survey Date	z. 1/31/03	1166	Nullibel. 175		
GENERAL	CHARACTERISTICS				
Species: _	Q. agrifoliaX	Q. lobata Other	Health Rating¹: □A □	B ⊠C- □D □ F	
			Form: symmetric minor asymmetry		
Trunk Cou	ınt: 1 Heigh	t : 18'			
Trunk DBI	l (in.): 11"		☐ stag-head		
Percent Ca	anopy Cover: * see r	ote below	Crown Class²: ☐ Decurrent ☐ Excurrent		
Existing T	errain: 🗌 FI	at 🛛 Slope	Age Class: ☐ immature ☐ semi-mature		
Aesthetic	Rating³: □A □B	S ⊠C- □D □ F			
Overall Gr	ade : □A □B	⊠C- □D □ F	Heritage Tree: 🛛 No	Heritage Tree: ⊠ No ☐ Yes	
CANODY	CHARACTERISTICS		TREE HEALTH		
CANOFIC	Dripline Radius	Canopy to Grade		xcellent	
	(Feet)	(Feet)	I III	oor None	
N	10	12	Foliage Density:*	☐ Normal ☐ Sparse	
NE			Weak crotches:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Е	0	0	Oak Pit Scale:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
SE			Mainstem dieback:*	☐ No ☐ Yes	
S	0	0	Exposed Roots:	☐ No Yes	
SW			Epicormic growth:	☐ No Yes	
W	23	7	Shading Out:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
NW			Cavities:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch	
			Exfoliating Bark:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
CANOPY SPREAD (FEET): 23		Water Pocket(s):	⊠ No ☐ Yes		
PROPOSED ACTIONS		Mechanical Damage:	☐ Trunk ☐ Branch		
Monitor fo	r Progress:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Canker/Galls:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Treat Infestations:		☐ Yes ☐ No	Fungus:	⊠ No ☐ Yes	
Remove Deadwood:		☐ Yes ☐ No	-	xcellent	
Support Structure:		☐ Yes ☐ No		air 🔲 Poor	
IMPACTS & MITIGATIONS			one		
In Impacted Area: Yes No		Leaf Size:*	☐ Normal ☐ Small		
Proposed Land Use: N/A		Heart Rot:	☐ No ⊠ Yes		
Impacts: None			Minor Moderate stensive		
Mitigations:			Exudations:	⊠ No □ Yes	

Comments & Notes: * = Survey taken during tree's dormant period; Previously tagged #104; several dead branches with heart rot where branches broke off; moss on branches

¹ Health: A =Outstanding; B = Above Average; C = Average; D = Below Average; F = Dead

² Decurrent = Lacking Strong Central Leader. Excurrent = Strong Central Leader.

 $^{^{3}}$ Aesthetic (compared to standard tree of same species) : A = nearly symmetrical, healthy tree – F = Dead

